City of Lafayette Staff Report

For:	City Council
By:	Sarah Allen, Planning Intern Michael P. Cass, Assistant Planner
Date Written:	April 28, 2009
Meeting Date:	May 11, 2009
Subject:	**GP02-09 CITY OF LAFAYETTE (APPLICANT):** Amending Growth Management Element of the Lafayette General Plan to comply with Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Measure J requirements. Amend Goals, Policies, and Programs in the Land Use, Circulation and Safety Elements for consistency with the Amended Growth Management Element. CONSIDERATION OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.
Statutory Deadline:	None

Purpose

To ensure the Growth Management Element ("GME") of the City's General Plan complies with Measure J and the City maintains compliance with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA") in order to receive transportation funds.

Background

In 1988, Contra Costa County voters approved Measure C, a half cent sales tax to be dedicated to transportation over a 20-year period. That measure sunsets in 2009; however, in 2004 the voters approved a 25-year extension to the tax, known as Measure J. The City currently receives over $300,000 per year in transportation funding for road maintenance as well as funds for other transportation improvements which are dependant on a Growth Management Element that complies with the provisions of the aforementioned measures.

The General Plan's current Growth Management Element establishes the policies and standards for traffic levels of service and performance standards for fire, police, parks, sanitary facilities, water, and flood control, among others. The objective is to establish goals, policies, and implementation programs that are intended to manage and mitigate the impacts of the inevitable future growth and development within the City.

Revenue collected through the increased sales tax is used for large mutually beneficial transportation projects identified in the Measure's Expenditure Plan (such as the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel) additionally each jurisdiction receives a portion of the remaining funding known as Return-To-Source Funds. To ensure the City continues to receive funding, the City must update the GME to comply with the requirements set forth in Measure J.

History

On March 2, 2009, the Circulation Commission reviewed the Amended Growth Management Element. The Commission recommended minor language modifications (which are included within the current Draft Element) and concurred with staff's recommendation to maintain the service standards and existing format. The Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval.

10B

On April 16, 2009, the Planning Commission reviewed the draft strikethrough and underlined version of the GME, as well as the draft Addendum to the 2002 General Plan Environmental Impact Report. The Commission was supportive of the modifications as proposed by staff and adopted Resolution 2009-05 (Attachment E), forwarding a recommendation of approval to the City Council to:

1. Amend the Growth Management Element of the General Plan as modified;
2. Amend the Land Use, Circulation and Safety Elements for consistency with the Amended Growth Management Element of the General Plan; and
3. Adopt the Addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

Components of the GME

The following table summarizes the required components for both Measure C and Measure J, and provides details on City compliance:

Component	Measure C	Measure J	City Compliance / Notes
Adopt Growth Management Element	✓	✓	Update to existing GME is pending.
Adopt Traffic Level of Service ("LOS") Standards	✓		City adopted LOS standards in existing GME. Staff recommends retention of LOS standards, despite being no longer required.
Adopt Performance Standards	✓		City adopted performance standards in existing GME. Staff recommends retention of standards, despite being no longer required.
Adopt a Development Mitigation Program	✓	✓	City has adopted development and traffic mitigation fees in conjunction with the Lamorinda Fee and Finance Committee.
Participate in Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Processes	✓	✓	City participates in the South West Area Transportation ("SWAT") Committee and the Lamorinda Action Plan.
Address Housing Opportunities	✓	✓	Update to the Housing Element of the General Plan is pending (tentative completion June 2009). Housing policies have been incorporated in the revised GME.
Address Employment Opportunities	✓		Employment opportunities are currently addressed in the Housing Element.
Develop a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program	✓	✓	City adopted a five-year Capital Improvement Program, covering 2007 through 2011.
Adopt a Transportation Systems Management Ordinance	✓	✓	City adopted (in 1994) and updated (in 1997) the Transportation Systems Management Ordinance, contained in Chapter 8-18 LMC.
Adopt an Urban Limit Line		✓	City adopted the County Urban Limit Line via Resolution 2008-39 in August 2008.

Agency Response

The existing Growth Management Element was provided to a number of referral agencies and stakeholders to solicit comments and modifications to the service standards. Refer to Attachment C for a complete list of referral agencies. The Lafayette Police Department, the County Sheriff and Acalanes School District responded with support for maintaining the existing service standards. The City of San Ramon and the Meher School responded with no comments on the subject application. The following comments were received at the time this staff report was prepared:

Central Sanitary District

- ❑ Most of the existing text of Policy LU-20.6 Sewage Treatment and Disposal can remain unchanged. Delete the parenthetical residential and nonresidential quantities (100 gallons per capita and 1500 gallons per acre respectively), since the District now use more land use specific wastewater generation factors for planning purposes.

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District

- ❑ Program S-4.1.3: The Fire District does not have the ability to improve fire flow.
- ❑ Program S-4.2.7: Refer to Chapter 3-5 of the Lafayette Municipal Code for enforcing fire sprinkler requirements. The 1.5 mile standard is only one component that may trigger the requirement for fire protection sprinklers. Being in excess of 1.5 miles in itself does not require the installation of fire sprinklers.

Contra Costa County Flood Control District

- ❑ Review Drainage Impact Fee to determine if the current rate of $0.10 is adequate.
- ❑ Clarify the language in Policy S-3.2, as the term "Flood Protection Standard" is usually associated with the 100-year flood event regardless of the size of watershed. Consider eliminating the reference to five square miles.

Contra Costa Transportation Authority

- ❑ "Findings of Consistency with the adopted LOS standards" is no longer required under Measure J.
- ❑ Policy C-1.2: The three paragraphs below the table "Level of Service Standards and Goals" are obsolete under Measure J. The City may retain these policies. However, the City shall eliminate the references to CCTA, Findings of Special Circumstances, and Reporting Intersections on Basic Routes.
- ❑ Policy C-10.3: Substitute "non-regional route" in place of the term "basic route" and "Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objective ("MTSO")" in place of Transportation Service Objective ("TSO")".

EBMUD

- ❑ Program LU20.7.2: Insert "and appropriate non-potable" after the word "potable".
- ❑ Program LU-20.7.4: Replace "extensive reclamation" with "extensive recycled water".
- ❑ Policy LU-20.7: Add the following programs:
  - ❑ Request EBMUD to complete a water supply assessment when required by Sections 10910 to 10915 of the California Water Code and Section 15155 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.
  - ❑ Require proposed developments located outside of EBMUD's current service area contact the Contra Costa County Local Area Formation Commission to apply for annexation. In addition, areas outside of EBMUD's current annexed service area require approval by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation prior to providing water service to any development.
  - ❑ Require project sponsors to submit copies of all known information regarding soil and groundwater quality within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries. Require a specific written remediation plan establishing the methodology, planning and design of all necessary

systems for the removal, treatment, and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater within construction area for pipelines and services.

- ❑ Inform project sponsors about water efficiency requirements of the EBMUD Water Service Regulations and local codes early in the design development process. Request that project applicants meet with EBMUD staff to discuss water efficient technology and best management practices applicable to their project.
- ❑ Require proposed projects per EBMUD's Policy 8.01 to use non-potable water for non-domestic purposes when it is of adequate quality and quantity, available at a reasonable cost, not detrimental to public health and not injurious to plant life, fish and wildlife to offset demand on EBMUD's limited potable water supply. As part of the water supply planning, EBMUD will consider the feasibility of providing recycled water to individual projects for appropriate uses, including landscape irrigation, commercial applications, industrial process uses, and other applications. Require project sponsors of new or redevelopment projects within the City to coordinate and consult with EBMUD regarding the feasibility of providing recycled water for appropriate non-potable purposes.

Parks Trails, & Recreation Department

- ❑ Language should be consistent with a previous General Plan Amendment GP01-08.

CEQA

Staff evaluated the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and determined that an Addendum to the 2002 General Plan Environmental Impact Report is required. Staff prepared the attached Addendum, which was reviewed by the City Attorney's Office. Staff determined that the proposed modifications to the Growth Management Element will not change the impacts or mitigations identified in the original General Plan Environmental Impact Report. Refer to Exhibit "E", as part of Attachment F.

Staff Analysis & Comments

Measure J requires local jurisdictions to consider and initiate several changes to the format and content of the Growth Management Element. Measure J no longer requires local jurisdictions to adopt specific service standards (such as standards for schools, parks, solid waste, and police services) or level of service standards. Staff recommends maintaining the service and performance standards in the Growth Management Element as they provide a public benefit and solidify the goals set forth in the General Plan.

Measure J also permits a city to revise the GME to utilize a table format, where applicable goals, policies, and programs from other General Plan Elements may be referenced. Staff recommends maintaining the existing chapter format, as the existing GME to provide easy access to the information contained in the Element.

Staff prepared a draft Growth Management Element by including language about Measure J and incorporating those changes with the proposed portions of the GME to remain.

Recommendation

Consider the matter, take public testimony and adopt Resolution 2009-21: (a) adopting the Addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report; (b) amending the Growth Management Element of the General Plan; and (c) amending the Land Use, Circulation and Safety Elements for consistency with the Amended Growth Management Element of the General Plan.

Attachments

A. Draft ~~Strike-Through~~ and Underline Version of Growth Management Element

B. Draft Circulation Commission Minutes, dated March 2, 2009
C. Draft Planning Commission Minutes, dated April 16, 2009
D. Referral Agencies List
E. Planning Commission Resolution 2009-05 without exhibits
F. Draft City Council Resolution 2009-21 with exhibits

DRAFT

CHAPTER VIII

GROWTH MANAGEMENT

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Growth Management is a concept that allows for a rate of growth that can be supported by the City's infrastructure and does not diminish the community's quality of life and identity. . The function of the Growth Management Element is to define the geographical extent of urban growth and manage the impacts of that growth by virtue of the Urban Limit Line. This element of the General Plan establishes policies and standards for traffic levels of service and performance standards for fire, police, parks, sanitary facilities, water and flood control that provides a long-range method of matching the demand for public facilities generated by new development with plans, capital improvements and development mitigation programs.

~~Lafayette has several constraints to meeting adopted service standards. As Lafayette's street system provides access to and from other jurisdictions, the most significant constraint is the large volumes of through-traffic on Lafayette's streets, especially Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Moraga Road, and Pleasant Hill Road north of Highway 24. Another significant constraint is that the City provides a limited range of services. Lafayette depends on separate agencies for most of its essential services including: potable water supply from the East Bay Municipal Utility District; wastewater treatment from the Contra Costa Central Sanitary District; and fire protection from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. The City contracts with the Contra Costa County Sheriff for police services. The City maintains ongoing communication with provider agencies for all services.~~

The goals, policies and programs in this section are consistent with the requirements of ~~the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program ("Measure C"), approved by Contra Costa County voters in 1988~~ Contra Costa's Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan ("Measure J") approved by Contra Costa County Voters in 2004 and with Government Code §65303.

BACKGROUND

The Measure J Growth Management Program, adopted by voters of Contra Costa County in November 2004, requires each local jurisdiction to meet the following six requirements:

- Adopt a development mitigation program;

Comment [MPC1]: Recommended by Circulation Commission.

Comment [SA2]: Staff inserted language to clarify purpose of element.

Comment [MPC3]: Staff moved to "Relation to Other Elements" Section on Page VIII-2.

Comment [SA4]: Staff removed irrelevant Measure C reference.

Comment [SA5]: Staff inserted this section to explain Measure J and for consistency with the CCTA's Model GME.

Attachment A

- Address Housing Options;
- Participate in an Ongoing Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process;
- Adopt an Urban Limit Line (ULL);
- Develop a five-year capital improvement program; and
- Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution.

Measure J (2004) is a 25-year extension of the previous Measure C Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program approved by the voters in 1988.

Both programs include a ½ percent tax on transportation use and retail transactions intended to address existing major regional transportation problems. The Growth Management component is intended to assure that future residential business and commercial growth pays for the facilities required to meet the demands resulting from that growth.

Compliance with the Growth Management Program is linked to receipt of Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds and Transportation for Livable Community funds from the Transportation Authority. The Growth Management Program defined by the original Ordinance 88-01 continues in effect along with its linkage to Local Street maintenance and improvement funds through March 31, 2009. Beginning on April 1, 2009, the Measure J Growth Management Program requirements take effect.

Measure J eliminates the previous Measure C mandate for local performance standards and level-of-service standards for non-regional routes. Lafayette elects to maintain these standards as part of this Element. Measure J also adds the requirement for adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line.

INTENT

Comment [SA6]: Staff inserted this section for consistency with the model GME.

By updating this Element, Lafayette intends to establish a comprehensive, long-range program that will match the demands for multi-modal transportation facilities and services generated by new development with plans, capital improvement programs and development mitigation programs. The Urban Limit Line is intended to promote compact urban development patterns and limits the extension of infrastructure into areas where urban development is not planned.

RELATION TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Comment [SA7]: Staff inserted this title as modeled in the sample GME.

Managing growth is integral to preserving all aspects of Lafayette's unique character; therefore, policies and programs appear throughout the Plan. Each area of *Growth Management* is addressed in its respective General Plan chapter, e.g. the *Circulation Chapter* contains goals, policies and programs dealing with traffic congestion and intersection levels of service; the *Safety Chapter* addresses fire and police protection and emergency services; and the *Land Use Chapter* sets forth goals, policies and programs on public facilities, schools and telecommunications. By design, the *Growth Management Chapter* brings together topics covered in other areas of the Plan. The goals, policies and programs needed to support the land uses

Deleted: ,

identified in this General Plan are restated in this chapter in order to provide a comprehensive look at growth management in one location in the Plan.

ORGANIZATION OF ELEMENT

Comment [SA8]: Inserted section for consistency with Model GME.

The Growth Management Element establishes goals and polices, and sets forth corresponding implementation programs, in the following section. The goals, policies, and programs are separated into three categories: Public Facilities and Capital Improvements, Demand for Public Services and Performance Standards, and Other Performance Standards.

SECTION II: GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

Comment [SA9]: Staff Inserted title and subtitle for consistency with Model GME.

Comment [SA10]: Inserted as clarification; recommended by Circulation Commission.

Growth Management is a concept that allows for a rate of growth that can be supported by the City's infrastructure and does not diminish the community's quality of life and identity. This vision is outlined in the goals and policies of the Circulation and Land Use Elements of the Lafayette General Plan some of which are reproduced in this section.

Lafayette has several constraints to meeting adopted service standards. As Lafayette's street system provides access to and from other jurisdictions, the most significant constraint is the large volumes of through-traffic on Lafayette's streets, especially Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Moraga Road, and Pleasant Hill Road north of Highway 24. Another significant constraint is that the City provides a limited range of services. Lafayette depends on separate agencies for most of its essential services including: potable water supply from the East Bay Municipal Utility District; wastewater treatment from the Contra Costa Central Sanitary District; and fire protection from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. The City contracts with the Contra Costa County Sheriff for police services. The City maintains ongoing communication with provider agencies for all services.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Adequate public facilities and services should be provided for new development, either through a development agreement or payment of a "fair share" of providing such facilities. In order to make reasonable provision for new facilities, the City of Lafayette shall establish public facility impact fees in cooperation with applicable districts. Impact fees may vary by location, according to the cost of improvements needed in the vicinity and the proportional share of the cost to be applied to the development.

Such fees will be established consistent with State law to implement the goals and policies of the General Plan, and may include charges for drainage improvements, traffic and roadway improvements and other capital improvements such as parks, trails and public facilities.

Excepting transportation improvements, the ~~CCTA~~ City requires that the approval body make one of the following findings before approving a development project: (1) performance standards will be maintained following the project, (2) specific mitigations are required of the project developer to ensure maintenance of adopted standards, or (3) capital projects planned by the City

or special district will result in maintenance of adopted standards. Such findings, mitigations, and capital projects must be consistent with approved action plans.

Comment [SA11]: The City Engineer and Transportation Planner recommend either eliminating this set of findings as they are no longer required or replacing "CCTA" with "City".

Goal LU-19 **Maintain the existing infrastructure essential to the public health and safety of the community.**

Policy LU-19.1[1] Capital Improvement Program: Maintain and update the five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Program LU-19.1.1: Implement the five-year Capital Improvement Program.

Program LU-19.1.2: Conduct Planning Commission review of CIP annually to ensure consistency with the General Plan.

Program LU-19.1.3: Continue the practice of including in the CIP a multi-year budget for projects including specific pavement management projects, an annual allowance for discretionary projects, and a fund for emergencies.

Program LU-19.1.4: Evaluate projects for the CIP using the following criteria: compliance with the General Plan; potential threat to health and safety; financial liability; protection of investment; cost of future maintenance; and visual impacts on the surrounding area. Other criteria may be added as needed to prioritize projects.

Program LU-19.1.5: Coordinate the timing of City capital improvement projects and those of other agencies (e.g. CALTRANS, the East Bay Municipal Utility District, the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District, and the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District) to optimize resources and minimize the impacts on residents.

Program: LU-19.1.6: Plan for adequate staff to implement the program.

Policy LU-20.13 Capital Improvement Program: Ensure that the Capital Improvement Program identifies capital projects necessary to maintain levels of performance as well as funding sources for all phases of intended projects.

Policy LU-19.2 Finance Capital Improvements: Provide public facilities to meet the needs generated by new development within Lafayette through continued planning and budgeting for public facilities and coordination with other agencies for public services the City does not provide.

Program LU-19.2.1: Evaluate the operating and maintenance costs of infrastructure improvements needed to support development.

Program LU-19.2.2: Provide information on development applications to other service-providing agencies, to enable them to assess the appropriate fair share impact fees. Request that the County require proof of payment of these fees before issuing a building permit.

Program LU-19.2.3: Implement the City's pavement management program to maintain Lafayette's roadways.

---

[1] Fulfills Measure J requirement to develop a five-year capital improvement program.

Program LU-19.2.4: Require new developments to pay their "fair share" of capital improvements and the cost of public services to maintain adequate levels of service. New development that creates incremental demand that exceeds the capacity of existing infrastructure shall be considered only through the development agreement process.

Program LU-19.2.5[2]: Maintain development and mitigation fees at a level adequate to finance infrastructure costs. Periodically review the City's fee structure to determine that it accurately reflects the actual cost of providing services, and recommend the appropriate revisions to the City Council.

DEMAND FOR PUBLIC SERVICES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Goal LU-20 **Match the demand for public facilities and infrastructure generated by new development with the capacity of existing facilities, capital improvement programs and development mitigation programs.**

Traffic Performance Standards

Policy LU-20.1 Traffic Service Standards: Consider the level of service ("LOS") goals and standards set forth in Policy C-1.2 of the *Circulation Chapter* when evaluating development proposals.

Refer to the Circulation Chapter for additional policies and programs regarding traffic LOS standards, goals, and mitigation programs ~~consistent with the requirements of "Measure C"~~.

~~The CCTA requires that projects estimated to generate over 100 peak hour vehicle trips to conduct a traffic impact study. In addition,~~ For projects expected to generate between 10-50 net new peak-hour trips, the Lamorinda ~~Project~~ Program Management Committee ("LPMC") ~~is required to review projects that are expected to add an additional 50 peak hour vehicle trips. In such instances, the approval body must make Findings of Consistency with the adopted Level of Service standards and approved action plans in order to approve the project, unless mitigations are in the five-year CIP or Findings of Special Circumstances have been made~~ supplemental notification of Lamorinda jurisdictions, SWAT jurisdictions and other CCTA regional transportation planning committees as required in the Lamorinda Action Plan Update. In addition, the CCTA requires that projects estimated to generate over 100 peak-hour vehicle trips to conduct a traffic impact study.

Policy C-1.2 Level of Service Standards and Goals: Establish the following level of service (LOS) standards and goals. Transportation improvements must be consistent with the community's strong desire to preserve Lafayette's unique identity and quality of life.

Comment [LG12]: Staff deleted Measure C reference.

Comment [SA13]: Staff moved to the last sentence in paragraph.

Comment [SA14]: Staff removed as no longer required under Measure J.

Comment [SA15]: Recommended by Circulation Commission with the goal of mentioning the Lamorinda Action Plan first.

[2] Fulfills Measure J requirement to adopt a development mitigation program.

Level of Service Standards and Goals

Signalized Intersections	LOS Standard[3]	~~CCTA~~ Standard V/C Ratio[4]	HCM Goal Stopped Delay At Peak Hours
Downtown Intersections	Poor D	0.85 to 0.89	33 to 40 Sec.
Intersections Outside Downtown	Good D	0.80 to 0.84	25 to 33 Sec.

These intersections correspond to CCTA's descriptions of "suburban" and "urban" intersections.

Comment [SA16]: Recommended by Circulation Commission as this is not a standard for CCTA anymore.

The standards shown above apply to all signalized intersections on non-regional routes ~~(routes other than "routes of regional significance" as defined by the CCTA)~~. The ~~CCTA~~ City considers Level of Service standards to be met if (1) measurement of actual conditions at the intersection indicates equal or better operation, or (2) ~~the jurisdiction has adopted~~ capital improvements in its five-year Capital Improvement Plan ~~that~~ will result in operations equal to or better than the standard. ~~, or (3) the jurisdiction has requested Findings of Special Circumstances from CCTA for intersections that will not meet the standard. The CCTA sees these findings as temporary and dependent upon proof of a future, workable solution.~~

Comment [MPC17]: Recommended by Martin Engelmann of CCTA.

If any signalized intersection along a ~~basic~~ non-regional route will not meet adopted standards, the City will first review the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Capital Improvement Plan and consider amendments aimed at meeting the standard. ~~before applying to CCTA for Findings of Special Circumstances.~~

Comment [SA18]: Recommended by Martin Engelmann of CCTA

Comment [SA19]: Staff removed as no longer required under Measure J.

When reporting to the CCTA, Lafayette will complete and submit the required Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. ~~as well as a list of Reporting Intersection on Basic Routes.~~

Comment [LG20]: Staff removed as no longer required under Measure J.

The following is a discussion regarding the conditions, challenges, and solutions related to Lafayette's regional and non-regional routes.

Comment [SA21]: Circulation Commission recommended a transition sentence here.

Pleasant Hill Road Corridor. Pleasant Hill Road north of State Route 24 carries the highest traffic volume of any Lafayette street. This street functions to connect Lafayette, the Lafayette BART station and State Route 24 with the cities of Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill and Martinez. Designated as Lafayette's only Route of Regional Significance, it is not subject to the adopted Level of Service Standards for ~~basic~~ non-regional routes. Instead, an Action Plan has

---

3 The level of service standard established by the *Draft General Plan* uses the CCTA methodology to calculate level of service standards. The HCM method is used to calculate level of service goals. Under the CCTA *Growth Management Plan* service level grades, such as LOS "A" or "B", are divided into high or low categories. A "high D". for example, means a higher volume to capacity ratio than does a "Low D". This definition has caused confusion since the *Growth Management Plan* definition states that a "high" letter grade means a worse level of service than does a "low" grade of the same letter. In order to clarify these definitions the LOS letter grades in the *Draft General Plan* are divided by categories defined as "Good" or "Poor". For example, a "Good D" in the Draft General Plan is equivalent to a "Low D" in the CCTA's *Growth Management Plan.*

4 As defined in the CCTA technical Proceedures.

been prepared that establishes ~~Traffic~~ Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's).

Comment [SA22]: Recommended by Martin Engelmann of CCTA

The majority of traffic on Lafayette's arterial roadways like Moraga Road and Pleasant Hill Road has its origin and destination outside the City limits. Residents of Moraga, Pleasant Hill and other areas use Lafayette's roadways to travel to and from Highway 24. As the population in neighboring communities continues to grow, so will automobile travel, congestion and delays. To address increasing demand, some jurisdictions have chosen to increase capacity. That alternative inevitably leads to competing goals within a jurisdiction and between jurisdictions as the community addresses the amount of increased demand capacity it is willing to develop. The CCTA has adopted a conflict resolution process for such disputes.

An alternative to increasing roadway capacity to accommodate increased demand, is to reduce travel demand in a number of ways. To this end, Lafayette has adopted a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance. The following related policies and programs appear in the Circulation Chapter.

Policy C-10.3 Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's): Work toward achieving Lafayette-approved multi-modal transportation service objectives on roads such as Highway 24 and Lafayette's portion of Pleasant Hill Road.

Lafayette is committed to implementing specified local actions in a timely manner, consistent with the adopted Pleasant Hill Road Action Plan a component of LPMC's Lamorinda Action Plan. This Action Plan, as adopted by the City Council, has been included by the CCTA in the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Designated as Lafayette's only Route of Regional Significance, it is not subject to the adopted Level of Service Standards for non-regional routes. Instead, an Action Plan has been prepared that establishes Multi-modal Traffic Service Objectives (MTSO's).

The City of Lafayette uses the CCTA's travel demand model for analysis of General Plan amendments affecting land use or circulation and development projects that generate more than the threshold number of peak hour trips in order to determine the effects on the regional transportation system and compliance with the MTSOs established in the Lamorinda Action Plan.

Comment [SA23]: Staff inserted language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J requirements for Multi-Jurisdictional transportation planning.

Policy C-7.1 Automobile Travel Demand: Seek to reduce vehicle trips by promoting alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.

Program C-7.1.1[5]: Continue to implement the City's *Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance*.

[5] Fulfills Measure J requirement to adopt a Transportation Systems Management Ordinance or Resolution.

OTHER PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Goal LU 17 **Establish and maintain clear limits to the future growth of Lafayette.**

Policy LU-17.1 Boundaries of the Sphere of Influence[6]: Maintain Lafayette's Sphere of Influence boundaries as a shown on Map I-7.

Goal LU-18 **Coordinate with other jurisdictions to protect and restore environmental resources and to provide public services.**

Policy LU-18.1[7] Interjurisdictional Participation: Participate in interjurisdictional planning.

Program LU-18.1.1: Consider the regional implications of land use decisions when reviewing development proposals and revisions to the Zoning Ordinance or the Lafayette General Plan.

Program LU-18.1.2: Work with other public entities to ensure that development in their jurisdictions does not adversely impact Lafayette's ability to achieve its General Plan goals.

Policy LU-18.2 Coordination of Public Services: Coordinate water supply, flood control, wastewater and solid waste disposal, soil conservation, and open space preservation with other jurisdictions to create the greatest public benefit and the least degree of environmental impact.

Program LU-18.2.1: Periodically review level of service standards with the districts providing water supply, flood control, wastewater and solid waste disposal, soil conservation, and open space preservation.

Refer to the Growth Management and Infrastructure Section for a discussion of levels of service for public services.

Program LU-18.2.2: Monitor growth and infrastructure capacity through project review under CEQA and through coordination with provider agencies.

Program LU-18.2.3: Consider infrastructure and service capacity when reviewing development proposals.

Policy LU-18.3 Regional Transportation Efforts: Participate in regional transportation planning efforts.

Refer to the Circulation Chapter for policies and programs related to the City's participation in regional transportation planning. Refer to the Growth Management and Infrastructure section regarding specific policies and programs of the Growth Management Plan.

Comment [SA24]: Staff inserted existing GP language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J.

Comment [SA25]: Staff inserted existing GP language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J.

---

[6] The City's Sphere of Influence is consistent with the Urban Limit Line defined in the Contra Costa County General Plan. The City formally adopted the voter approved County Urban Limit Line via Resolution 2008-39. Fulfills Measure J requirement to adopt an Urban Limit Line.

[7] Fulfills Measure J requirement to participate in on-going cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process.

Policy LU-20.2 Schools: Coordinate planning with the Lafayette School District and the Acalanes Union High School District so that Lafayette's school-aged children are well-served by the school system.

Program LU-20.2.1: Maintain close communications with the school district on development review and land use issues.

Policy LU-20.3 Child and Family Day Care: Work with public and private day care providers to provide programs for child care and family day care.

Program LU-20.3.1: Revise the Zoning Ordinance to permit day care facilities, subject to a conditional use permit with findings that address issues such as neighborhood compatibility, traffic, safety, and noise.

Policy LU-20.4 Fire: Review all development projects for their impacts on standards for fire service specified in the General Plan: fire stations three miles apart in urban areas, six miles apart in rural areas, with a five-minute response time. Require fair share payments and/or mitigation measures to ensure that these standards or their equivalent are maintained.

Program LU-20.4.1: Work with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District to improve fire prevention and protection services.

Program S-4.1.3: Encourage the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District including paramedic services to improve its response time ~~and fireflow~~ for Lafayette, particularly in the urban wildland fire interface zones. The location of fire stations should strive for a five-minute response time.

Comment [SA26]: Ted Leach of CCCFPD indicated the fire district does not have the ability to improve fire flow. Fire flow is addressed in Program S-4.1.6 of the Safety Element in the General Plan.

Program S-4.2.7: Enforce the Fire Safety Ordinance requiring sprinkler systems for new residential development more than 1.5 miles from a fire station, ~~or~~ beyond the 3-minute response time, and other applicable triggers.

Comment [SA27]: Ted Leach of CCCFPD noted the ordinance has more triggers than the ones mentioned in this program.

Refer to the Safety Chapter for additional policies and programs on Fire Services.

Program LU-20.4.3: Consider alternatives and efficiency measures to the public safety delivery system so that response times meet service level standards.

Policy S-7.1 Police Services: Review development proposals for their demand on police services and require mitigating measures, if necessary, to maintain the community's standard for police services. Levy police impact fees for capital facilities and equipment, if warranted.

Policy S-7.2 Interjurisdictional Cooperation: Work with the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department and neighboring jurisdictions to improve police service in Lafayette.

Policy S-7.3 Response Time Standards: Strive to maintain a three-minute response time for all life-threatening calls and those involving criminal misconduct, and a seven-minute response time for the majority of non-emergency calls.

Policy LU-20.6 Sewage Treatment and Disposal: Coordinate planning with the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District to ensure the continued availability of adequate sewage

collection, treatment, and disposal facilities to meet the needs of future development. The standard for review shall be the capability to transport and treat to standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board average daily effluent for all residential ~~(100 gallons per capita)~~ and nonresidential ~~(1500 gallons per acre)~~ projects.

Comment [MPC28]: Revision suggested by Russell Leavitt of CCCSD. 2009-02-03 Wastewater generation factors are now more land-use specific.

Comment [MPC29]: Revision suggested by Russell Leavitt of CCCSD. 2009-02-03 Wastewater generation factors are now more land-use specific.

Policy LU-20.7 Water: Coordinate planning with the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) to ensure the availability of an adequate potable water supply to meet the needs of the future population. The standard for development review shall be the capacity to provide sufficient water to all residents and businesses in the City, as indicated by EBMUD.

Program LU-20.7.1: Ensure that service agreements for new development are in place that establish a level of service in accordance with this Plan and the EBMUD.

Program LU-20.7.2: Require developers to enter into agreements in accordance with the regulations and ordinances of the EBMUD and pay for the cost of potable and appropriate non-potable water infrastructure required for each project.

Comment [SA30]: Recommended by EBMUD.

Program LU-20.7.3: Require fair share payments and/or mitigation measures to ensure that these standards or their equivalent are maintained.

Program LU-20.7.4: Do not approve new development if EBMUD cannot assure an adequate supply of water.

Program LU-20.7.5: Request EBMUD to complete a water supply assessment when required by Sections 10910 through 10914 of the California Water Code and Section 15155 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidlelines.

Program LU-20.7.6: Require that proposed developments located outside of EBMUD's current service area contact the Contra Costa County Local Agency Formation Commission to apply for annexation. In addition, areas outside of EBMUD's current annexed service area require approval by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation prior to providing water service to any development.

Program LU-20.7.7: Where a new main is necessary, require project sponsors to submit copies of all known information regarding soil and groundwater quality within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries. When contamination exists, require a specific written remediation plan establishing the methodology, planning, and design of all necessary systems for the removal, treatment, and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater within a construction area for pipelines and services.

Program LU-20.7.8: Make project sponsors aware of the water efficiency requirements of the EBMUD Water Service Regulations and local codes early in the design development process. Request that project applicants meet with EBMUD staff to discuss water efficient technology and best management practice applicable to their project.

Program LU-20.7.9: Require project sponsors of new or redevelopment projects within the City, where a new main is required, to coordinate and

consult with EBMUD regarding the feasibility of providing recycled water for appropriate non-potable purposes per EBMUD's policy 8.01.

Comment [SA31]: These programs are recommended by William Kirkpatrick of EBMUD.

EBMUD adopted a Water Supply Management Program in 1993. This program recognized that there may be supply limitations to the future expansion of EBMUD's service area. In the event of a threatened or actual water shortage, the District will give first priority to existing water customers within its existing service area.

Several of the District's supply lines need to be rebuilt and seismically strengthened. The rehabilitation of EBMUD's delivery system is being addressed by the District's Capital Improvement Program.

EBMUD has developed an extensive ~~reclamation~~ recycled water and water conservation program. The District recommends certain types of landscaping for new and existing development, which require minimal water. It is up to local jurisdictions, however, to implement water conservation regulations. Refer to the Open Space and Conservation Chapter for policies regarding water conservation.

Comment [SA32]: Recommended by EBMUD.

Policy LU-20.8 Parks: Apply the maximum standard for parks to new development.

Program. P-1.3.1: Use the standard of up to five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents for the dedication, acquisition, and improvement of parkland pursuant to the provisions of the Quimby Act. (Government Code §66477)

Comment [SA33]: Revision suggested by Jennifer Russell of PTR to ensure consistency with GP01-08. (Taken from Resolution 2008-16) 2009-02-02

Refer to the Parks, Trails and Recreation Chapter for policies and programs regarding parks, trails and recreational facilities.

Policy LU-20.9 Solid Waste: Review all development projects for their impacts on the City's goals contained in the *Source Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element*[8]. Require fair share payments and/or mitigation measures to ensure that these standards are not jeopardized.

Program LU-20.9.1: Require that appropriate solid waste disposal and recycling facilities are provided for all development projects.

Program LU-20.9.2: Require new development to show how it can meet state mandated recycling goals.

Policy LU-20.10 Build out Projections: Use the build out projections for Lafayette and the region to establish goals for environmental protection and community character and to provide the basis for all public facilities planning.

Refer to Table 6 in the Land Use Chapter for build out data.

Policy LU-20.11 City Administrative Services: Provide general government administration services as comprehensively and efficiently as possible. Consider environmental impacts in selecting locations for City services.

8 This element is not a part of the General Plan but a separately adopted plan.

Policy LU-20.12 Growth Management Implementation: Review development projects for conformance with adopted performance standards. Require mitigation measures where necessary to maintain adopted standards. Capital improvements shall be in place at the time of project implementation when necessary to maintain adopted performance standards.

Policy LU-20.14 Storm Drainage: Require new development to mitigate its impact on the storm drainage system.

Policy S-3.2 Flood Protection Standard: In the review of flood control for proposed new development, establish as a standard the flood recurrence intervals used by the Contra Costa County Flood Control District (e.g. the 100-year flood event) ~~for watersheds with area greater than five square miles.)~~

Program S-3.2.1: Utilize the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) to reduce risk of flooding, identify 100 Year Flood Events, to calculate flow rates within identified stream channels, and to review development proposals.

Program S-3.2.2: Participate in the National Flood Insurance program.

Refer to the Safety Chapter for additional policies and programs regarding flood control.

Comment [SA34]: Recommended by CCC Flood Control District as the term "Flood Protection Standard" refers to a 100-year flood event regardless of the size of the watershed.

Goal C-4 **Coordinate land use and circulation planning.**

Program C-4.1.2: Consider transit-oriented developments which are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan.

Program C-4.2.2: Ensure that new developments provide adequate on-site improvements, such as delivery access, on-site vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation amenities, public transit facilities, and off-street parking, as appropriate.

Comment [SA35]: Staff inserted existing GP language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J requirement to address housing options.

Policy LU-8.3 Mixed Uses: Support mixed-use developments in the Downtown that do not conflict with the primarily retail focus of this area.

Program LU-8.3.1: Develop incentives to promote retention and development of residential units in buildings Downtown.

Goal H-2[9] **Facilitate and encourage the development of diverse housing types and additional affordable housing units to accommodate a diversity of Lafayette citizens in terms of age and socio-economic background and to meet regional housing needs to be specified in the Housing Element.**

Comment [SA36]: Staff inserted existing GP language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J requirements to address housing options.

Policy H-2.1 Mixed Use: Encourage the rehabilitation and development of residential uses in commercial areas where the viability of the commercial activities would not be adversely affected.

[9] Fulfills Measure J requirement to address housing options.

Program H-2.1.1: Housing Rehabilitation in Non-Residential Areas: Continue to permit ~~new housing units and~~ housing rehabilitation in commercial zoning districts. ~~subject to approval of a land use permit as specified in the Zoning Ordinance.~~

Comment [SA37]: Staff revised for consistency with Housing Element update.

Policy H-2.7 Infill Housing: Encourage private housing development on existing infill sites in order to efficiently utilize existing infrastructure.

Refer to the Housing Chapter for additional housing implementation programs.

Comment [SA38]: Staff inserted existing GP language to demonstrate compliance with Measure J requirement to address housing options.

Goal LU-21 **Encourage the availability of high-quality telecommunications services to Lafayette's citizens, schools, government and businesses.**

Policy LU-21.1 Telecommunications: Provide improved telecommunications infrastructure.

Program LU-21.1.1: Develop a plan for improving the telecommunications infrastructure linking the community together.

Program LU-21.1.2: Encourage and facilitate public/private partnerships and networks to improve the City's telecommunications infrastructure.

Program LU-21.1.3: Establish standards for telecommunications infrastructure in the public right-of-way and for private development.

EXCERPT

City of Lafayette
Circulation Commission Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes

Lafayette Community Center
Lafayette, CA

March 2, 2009
7:00 PM

1. Call to Order Chair Ross called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM.

2. Roll Call

Present: Chair Ross, Vice Chair Hiden, Commissioners Holit, and Sevilla

Absent: Commissioners Hughes, Poling, and Wood (excused)

BPAC: None

Staff: Ms. Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner; Mr. Michael Cass, Assistant Planner, Ms. Sarah Allen, Planning Intern, Mr. Chuck DeLeuw, Consulting Traffic Engineer; Ms. Marie Pettersen, Contract Minutes Taker

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Vice Chair Hiden requested to pull the minutes of February 17, 2009 from the Consent Calendar.

Staff requested to reverse the order taking Item 6A before Item 5A.

Vice Chair Hiden moved and Commissioner Holit seconded to adopt the agenda as amended. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. Public Comments

Marisa Pessis, representing the Lafayette Homeowners Council, said their Council sent a letter to City Council to thank them for their hard work on the plan. Widespread dislike for the plan was expressed at the public workshop such as with the height of the buildings, and the housing density. The architect said this was a homogeneous town but it represents a change in the community. It is not clear from the plan how traffic would be improved. With this plan they would lose Lafayette's semi-rural atmosphere. She asked that the Commission read the letter that they sent.

George Burtt representing the Acalanes Valley Homeowners Association, said their association is a signatory to the letter. They have a problem with the proposed higher density, the loss of gas stations. They do not approve of the proposed road across from Happy Valley and Bickerstaff streets and the road through them.

Vice Chair Hiden asked how many homes there were in their respective homeowners associations.

Mr. Burtt said there were 440.

Ms. Pessis said there were 62.

Vice Chair Hiden said the Commission was told that the road from First Street to Happy Valley was for local use but Carol Singer told her that it was for access to connecting to the freeway on-ramp.

Mr. Burtt said the map as in the plan has not changed and in response to Vice Chair Hiden said that his Homeowners' Association had not commented on the road.

5. New Business

a. Update to the Lafayette General Plan's Growth Management Element

Ms. Allen said the City of Lafayette currently receives approximately $300,000 per year in transportation funding from the Measure C half-cent sales tax. Measure J is a 25-year extension of Measure C. The transportation funds the City receives are dependent upon a Growth Management Element that complies with the measures. To ensure that the City continues to receive funds, staff has prepared a draft Growth Management Element including language about Measure J and incorporating the required changes.

Ms. Greenblat said as part of the transition from Measure C to Measure J, the CCTA developed a model draft Growth Management Element which serves as the basis for most of the proposed changes.

Vice Chair Hiden said the Level of Service Standards and Goals should be kept in because it might enable the City to deny a development application. On page 3 of 3 of staff's report, staff recommended maintaining the existing Growth Management Element and not utilizing a table format and Vice Chair Hiden wondered if they could do both: leave it as it is and include it in the table format. She feels the first sentence of the Draft Growth Management Plan, should read: "Growth Management *is a concept that* allows for a rate of growth..." She does not like the second sentence and feels the City's policy element, General Plan, and Urban Limit Line define the geographical extent of urban growth and manages the impacts of that growth but she does not think that applies to the Growth Management Plan.

Ms. Greenblat said she felt that was the intent of the Urban Limit Line.

Vice Chair Hiden said that then the City should say by virtue of the Urban Limit Line. She continued on Page 2 of the Draft Plan, second paragraph, she feels it would be better to understand the sentence by adding a hyphen after "transportation", after "transactions", and after "use tax". In the fourth paragraph on Page 2, she suggested changing the first sentence to read: "Measure J *renders optional* the previous Measure C requirements...."

Ms. Greenblat said she said she is concerned that optional makes it sound like Measure J is an option and it is not.

Mr. Cass suggested changing the sentence to read: "Measure J eliminates the previous Measure C *mandate* requirements..."

Vice Chair Hiden agreed to this change. She would then put a period after "...non-regional routes" eliminating the word "however" and starting "Lafayette elects to maintain..." as a new sentence.

Vice Chair Hiden suggested changing the word "adopting" in the first paragraph under Intent to "updating". She also suggested changing the word "*restrict* the extension of infrastructure" to "*slow* the extension of infrastructure" in the last line of the same paragraph. In the first paragraph under Introduction to Section II, Vice Chair Hiden again wanted to add that "Growth Management *is a concept that allows* for a rate of growth..." in the same paragraph she recommended adding "Lafayette" before General Plan to clarify whose General Plan the paragraph referred to.

Vice Chair Hiden continued in the second paragraph, after "...north of Highway 24...", she would add the following: "*due to our Orinda formation soil and watershed topography resulting in a highly constrained road infrastructure with few opportunities for expansion.*"

Mr. DeLeuw asked what the purpose of adding this language would be.

Vice Chair Hiden answered to say the reasoning why the City is constrained.

Mr. DeLeuw said her sentence is more justifiable in regards to an alternate route rather than sometime in the future. He did not want the statement to be susceptible to attack.

Vice Chair Hiden asked if he could work on some wording to reflect her intent that would be acceptable, and Mr. DeLeuw agreed to do this.

Vice Chair Hiden asked who the approving body was as stated in the third paragraph under Public Facilities and Capital Improvements: "Excepting transportation improvements, the CCTA requires that the *approval body...*". She feels some of these Action Plans may no longer be applicable.

Ms. Greenblat said the Action Plans and their reviews are still applicable and this sentence should clarify this is referring to previous requirements that were action Plan specific.

Vice Chair Hiden asked Ms. Greenblat to come up with language that would clarify this. On page 5, in the third paragraph under Traffic Performance Standards, Vice Chair Hiden wondered if the "...notification of Lamorinda jurisdictions, SWAT jurisdictions...", are they still referring things to SWAT in Measure J.

Ms. Greenblat replied that was correct but in the last part of that sentence it says "...as required in the Lamorinda Action Plan Update.

Vice Chair Hiden asked if that sentence could start with that portion of the sentence rather than ending with it to make it clearer to readers. She continued that on Page 6 the table at the top addresses the CCTA Standard V/C Ratio and she wondered if they were still keeping them because they were no longer standards.

Ms. Greenblat said they should delete CCTA. She continued that they would want to keep them as standards but not as CCTA standards any longer. She suggested adding a footnote stating "As used by CCTA Technical Procedures." Vice Chair Hiden agreed.

Vice Chair Hiden asked if in the first paragraph on page 6 under (2), if "jurisdiction" should read "City" or whether that mattered, to which Ms. Greenblat replied that it did not matter.

Vice Chair Hiden continued on Page 8 under Policy LU-18.1[6], it should state "*Lafayette* General Plan". On Page 12, under Policy H.2.3.1, she would like to add something about improving pedestrian amenities or facilitation. She said it would be nice to be able to collect money applicable to something else besides developing affordable housing.

Ms. Greenblat said it was her understanding that this was already in the Housing Element so if they made a change to it in the Growth Management Element, they would then also need to make a change to the Housing Element.

Mr. Cass said the two elements must be consistent and if they want to address housing, they need to address this in the Housing Element, which is currently being processed. Staff will pass this comment along to Ms. Srivatsa.

Ms. Greenblat asked if the Commission was comfortable with Vice Chair Hiden's comments.

Commissioner Sevilla said referring to Vice Chair Hiden's comment on page 2 under Intent, she feels that "*restrict* the extension of infrastructure..." should remain as it is and not be changed to "*slow*". The Commission agreed to by consensus to leave the sentence as submitted.

Vice Chair Hiden moved and Commissioner Holit seconded adoption of agreed upon changes as suggested by Vice Chair Hiden. Mr. DeLeuw will attempt to provide language to reflect Vice Chair Hiden's concern on Page 3 under Introduction of Section II. If Mr. DeLeuw is not able to come up with appropriate language, then the sentence will remain as submitted. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Cass said staff will prepare the appropriate CEQA documents, including an anticipated addendum to the General Plan EIR. This application is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the Planning Commission on April 16th and the City Council in May and/or June.

6. Old Business

a. Continuation of Review of the Lafayette Downtown Strategy and Specific Plan, January 2009 Draft

Ms. Greenblat said that based upon comments received at the joint meeting, staff was directed to summarize the comments for the Commission to review. The Commission requested that these comments be forwarded to the Planning Commission and what was forwarded has been included in the staff report. Chair Ross assisted staff in preparing the cover memo summarizing the Commission's key points. Staff recommends the Commission review and confirm the individual Commissioner and BPAC members comments to confirm if there is support for these comments to represent the entire Commission.

Vice Chair Hiden expressed concerns about the park once concept and the ability of mothers with children or the handicapped to only park once. She does not feel they should force the community to do this. She would like to add Item e. to the cover letter stating: The dependence of this plan for success with so many residents (naming the types of residents e.g. elderly, handicapped) unable to take advantage of the usefulness of the park.

Ms. Greenblat said the consultant was assuming diversity in the needs and abilities of residents and how applicable this concept would be to the community as a whole. They could clarify/articulate that this was not intended for everyone or if it is they would need to figure out how to accommodate those with special needs.

Commissioner Sevilla said she felt the development of a downtown park once concept is suitable in the matrix under the correct item but not in the cover letter.

Ms. Greenblat said the consultants will review the many comments that are received but the cover letter was intended to serve as an executive summary to highlight the Commission's main concerns for the many members of the public who will not review all of the Commission's 100+ comments.

Vice Chair Hiden said she liked the park once concept but feels it is not applicable to certain groups.

Chair Ross said there was not enough detail on how this will succeed.

Ms. Greenblat suggested draft language that the Commission supports the park once concept but is concerned due to the significant portion of disabled, children, and seniors within Lafayette.

Mr. DeLeuw said that he sees the Commission's concern that this is a mandate and not an opportunity and that it will limit the travel ability of folks not able to take advantage of this concept.

Chair Ross and Ms. Greenblat will draft appropriate language to express the Commission's concerns on this issue in the cover letter.

EXCERPT

City of Lafayette
Planning Commission Meeting
DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, April 16, 2009, 7:00 pm
Lafayette Community Center, 500 St. Mary's Road, Manzanita Room

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Lovitt called the meeting to order, stating all commissioners were present.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Lovitt, Vice Chair Chastain, Commissioners Ateljevich, Curtin-Tinley, Humann, Maggio & Mitchell
Absent: None.
Staff Present: Sarah Allen, Planning Intern; Michael P. Cass, Assistant Planner; and Niroop K. Srivatsa, Planning and Building Services Manager

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Chair Lovitt asked for a motion to adopt the agenda, which was given by Commissioner Maggio. A second was given by Commissioner Chastain, which was carried by unanimous consent. (7-0-0)

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chair Lovitt opened the floor for public comments. There was no one wishing to speak.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Lovitt asked if anyone wished to pull any items from the consent calendar. When no one asked for this, he asked for a motion to approve the consent calendar. This was given by Commissioner Maggio. A second was given by Commissioner Ateljevich, which was carried by unanimous consent. (7-0-0)

6. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. GP02-09 CITY OF LAFAYETTE (APPLICANT): Amending Growth Management Element of the Lafayette General Plan to comply with Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Measure J requirements. Amend Goals, Policies, and Programs in the Land Use, Circulation and Safety Elements for consistency with the Amended Growth Management Element. CONSIDERATION OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT.

Chair Lovitt asked for a staff report.

Planning Intern Sarah Allen explained that before the Commissioners is the update to the Growth Management Element of the General Plan. She indicated that more than $300,000.00 per year is received by Lafayette in transportation funding from Measure C. The tax was supposed to end in 2009, but in 2004 voters approved a 25-year extension to the measure, known as Measure J. To maintain the current level of funding, the City must update the Growth Management Element to comply with Measure J. Directing the Commissioners to Page 2 of the staff report, she noted that while Measures C and J are similar, they are different in several ways. Measure J does not require the Element to contain the traffic level of service or performance standards. Measure J requires an urban limit line to be adopted by the City. The new requirements permit restructuring the element to contain a correspondence table in lieu of a chapter format; however, staff recommends the Element maintain the existing chapter format as it provides easy access to the information, provide a public benefit, and increase the

accountability of the City to strive for those standards. Staff also suggests maintaining the level of service standards, as they provide common terminology that would enable the City to engage in multiple jurisdictional planning, which is a Measure C and J requirement. Staff solicited comments from several agencies and those comments are outlined beginning on Page 2 of the staff report. She noted that with the exception of the Flood District's comment with regard to the drainage impact fee, all comments were incorporated into the Updated Element, Attachment A. The draft version of the element was reviewed by the Circulation Commission at the March 2, 2009 meeting. Minor language modifications were incorporated in relation to their recommendations. The Circulation Commission concurred that the existing format and service standards should be maintained and forwarded a recommendation for approval to the Planning Commission and City Council. The project was evaluated in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and staff determined that an addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report was required. Upon completion of the addendum, staff noted that the proposed modifications would not change the impacts identified or the mitigations required in the 2002 General Plan EIR. She added that this draft addendum is the last exhibit attached on the resolution. Ms. Allen stated that as the Growth Management Element is a combination of policies and programs found throughout the General Plan, updates to other elements are required to maintain consistency. She directed the Commissioners to yellow sheets placed on the dais listing the modifications made by the City Council as they reviewed the Draft Housing Element Update. These modifications are intended to be incorporated into the Growth Management Element. Staff recommends that the Commission consider the matter, take public testimony and adopt Resolution 2009-05, forwarding a recommendation of approval to the City Council to amend the Growth Management Element, as well as Land Use, Circulation, and Safety Elements of the General Plan to maintain consistency, and adopt the addendum to the General Plan EIR.

Chair Lovitt asked if there were questions for staff.

Commissioner Mitchell stated that in reading the Circulation Commission's minutes he did not note any controversy in forwarding a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission and City Council. He queried if there were aspects of the Element found to be challenging by staff, or if the desire is just to comply with the Measure J requirements.

Ms. Allen confirmed that there were only minor language modifications made by the Circulation Commission. Ms. Allen indicated that staff followed a model Element and incorporated comments from referral agencies. Staff did not find any aspects of the Element challenging.

Commissioner Curtin-Tinley asked for confirmation that a new urban limit line does not need to be created, and that simply confirming the existing urban limit line of the County would be sufficient.

Ms. Allen said that this is correct and that the County urban limit line was adopted.

Commissioner Maggio asked about the four requirements for determining if fire protection sprinklers are required.

Ms. Allen responded the four triggers include water pressure and distance from a fire station. Assistant Planner Michael Cass added that the triggers also include square footage and vehicular access.

Chair Lovitt asked for public comment. As there was none, he closed the public portion and asked for comments from the Commissioners. As there were no comments, Chair Lovitt asked for a motion.

Commissioner Maggio made a motion that Resolution 2009-05 be adopted with the additional modifications as set forth by the City Council. This was seconded by Commissioner Ateljevich, which was carried by unanimous consent. (7-0-0)

8. OTHER BUSINESS

A. UPDATE ON THE DOWNTOWN STRATEGY

Commissioner Lovitt wanted to know which of the Commissioners would be at the upcoming May 9th meeting on the Downtown Strategy. He would not be able to attend.

CCC Fire Protection District
Attn: Fire Marshal Richard Carpenter
2010 Geary Road
Pleasant Hill CA, 94523

East Bay Regional Park District
Attn: Jim Townsend
2950 Peralta Oaks Ct.
P.O. Box 5381
Oakland, CA 94605

East Bay Municipal Utility District
Attn: Nora Harlow
P.O. Box 24055
Oakland, CA 94623

City of Lafayette Transportation Planning
Attn: Leah Greenblat
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd. Ste. 210
Lafayette, CA 94549

Lafayette School District
Attn: Parent-Teacher Association
P.O. Box 1029
Lafayette, CA 94549

Contra Costa Jewish Day School
Attn: Dean Goldfein
P.O. Box 195
Lafayette, CA 94549

Lafayette Chamber of Commerce
Attn: Jay Lifson
100 Lafayette Circle Ste. 103
Lafayette, CA 94549

Town of Moraga
Attn: Calvin Wong
2100 Donald Drive
Moraga, CA 94556

Valley Waste Management
Attn: Tom Remigio
2658 N. Main Street
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

County Connection
Attn: Director of Transportation
2477 Arnold Industrial Way
Concord, CA 94520

City of Lafayette Police Department
Attn: Chief Hubbard
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd. Ste. 130
Lafayette, CA 94549

City of Lafayette Parks Trails & Recreation
Attn: Jennifer Russell
500 St. Mary's Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

City of Lafayette Engineering
Attn: Tony Coe
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd. Ste. 210
Lafayette, CA 94549

CAL TRANS
Dept. of Transportation
Attn: Lee Taubeneck
P.O. Box 23660 Dist. #4
Oakland, CA 94623

Bentley School
Attn: Richard P. Fitzgerald
1000 Upper Happy Valley Rd.
Lafayette, CA 94549

Old Firehouse School
Attn: Dorothy Stewart
984 Moraga Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

Lafayette Homeowners Council
Attn: Maeve Pessis
1118 Laurel Drive
Lafayette, CA 94549

Town of Danville
Attn: Tai Williams
400 Front Street
Danville, CA 94526

Contra Costa Community Development
Attn: John Cunningham
651 Pine Street
Martinez, CA 94553

Contra Costa Transit Authority
Attn: Martin Engelmann
3478 Buskirk Avenue, Suite 100
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

CCC Sheriff's Office
Attn: Warren Rupf
40 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553

CCC Sanitary District
Attn: Jim Kelly
5019 Imhoff Place
Martinez, CA 94553

City of Lafayette Public Works
Attn: Ron Lefler
3001 Camino Diablo
Lafayette, CA 94549

Acalanes Union High School District
Attn: Parent-Teacher Association
1212 Pleasant Hill Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

St. Perpetua School
Attn: Karen Goodshaw
3454 Hamlin Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

Meher School
Attn: Principal
999 Leland Drive
Lafayette, CA 94549

City of Orinda
Attn: Emmanuel Ursu
22 Orinda Way
Orinda, CA 94563

City of San Ramon
Attn: Lisa Bobadilla
2228 Camino Ramon
San Ramon, CA 94583

Bay Area Rapid Transit
Attn: Deidre Heitman
300 Lakeside Drive 16th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612

SF Regional Water Quality Control Board
Attn: Thomas Mumley
1515 Clay St
Suite 1400
Oakland, CA 94612

City of Walnut Creek
Attn: Victoria Walker
1666 North Main Street
Walnut Creek., CA 94596

City of Pleasant Hill
Attn: Troy Fujimoto
100 Gregory Lane
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Department of Fish and Game
Attn: Chuck Armor
7329 Silverado Trail
Napa, CA 94558

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Attn: Steve Heminger
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Association of Bay Area Governments
Attn: Ken Kirkey
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94604-2050

City of San Ramon
Attn: Debbie Chamberlain
2228 Camino Ramon
San Ramon, CA 94583

'own of Moraga
.ttn: Lori Salamack
100 Donald Drive
Ioraga, CA 94556

Town of Danville
Attn: Steve Lake
400 Front Street
Danville, CA 94526

CCC Flood Control
Attn: Greg Connaughton
4785 Blum Road
Martinez 94553

Acalanes Union High School District
Attn: Jim Negri
1212 Pleasant Hill Road
Lafayette, CA 94549

Lafayette School District
Attn: Fred Brill
P.O. Box 1029
Lafayette, CA 94549

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE

IN THE MATTER OF:

A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Lafayette Recommending Amending the Growth Management Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan, which Includes Amendments to the Circulation Element, Land Use Element, and Safety Element of the General Plan in Compliance with Measures C and J

Resolution No. 2009-05

WHEREAS, the City desires to amend the Growth Management Element of the General Plan, which includes amendments to the Circulation Element, Land Use Element, and Safety Element of the General Plan to establish a comprehensive, long-range program that will match the demands for multi-modal transportation facilities and services generated by new development with plans, capital improvement programs and development mitigation programs in compliance with Measures C and J ("General Plan Amendment");

WHEREAS, the General Plan Amendment was referred to all affected public agencies pursuant to Government Code section 65352;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") the City analyzed the environmental impacts that would result from the proposed General Plan Amendment and compared them to the impacts analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") previously prepared for the General Plan;

WHEREAS, the City determined that an Addendum to the General Plan EIR should be prepared pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15164 since the General Plan Amendment would not result in any new or substantially greater significant impacts, as documented by the analysis contained in the Addendum;

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2009, the Planning Commission of the City of Lafayette ("Planning Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the General Plan Amendment, at which time all persons wishing to testify in connection with the General Plan Amendment were heard and the General Plan Amendment was fully studied; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Section 1. Based on the entire record before the Planning Commission, all written and oral evidence presented to the Planning Commission, and the findings made in this Resolution, the Planning Commission hereby recommends to the City Council: (a) amending the Growth Management Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; (b) amending the Circulation Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; (c) amending the Land Use Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "C" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and (d) amending the Safety Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "D" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. An Addendum has been prepared for the General Plan Amendment in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State CEQA Guidelines and the Planning Commission hereby recommends adoption of the Addendum attached hereto as Exhibit "E" and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 3. The location and custodian of the documents and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council based its decision is as follows: City Clerk, City of Lafayette, 3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd. #210, Lafayette, California 94549-1968.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Lafayette at a regular meeting of said Commission on April 16, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES:	**Ateljevich, Chastain, Curtin-Tinley, Humann, Lovitt, Maggio, Mitchell**
NOES:	**None**
ABSENT:	**None**
ABSTAIN:	**None**

ATTEST:

Niroop K. Srivatsa
Planning and Building Services Manager

APPROVED:

Will Lovitt
Chair, Lafayette Planning Commission

Attachments

1. Exhibit "A" - Amendments to Growth Management Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
2. Exhibit "B" - Amendments to Circulation Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
3. Exhibit "C" - Amendments to Land Use Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
4. Exhibit "D" - Amendments to Safety Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
5. Exhibit "E" – Addendum to General Plan Environmental Impact Report

DRAFT

BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE

IN THE MATTER OF:

A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lafayette Amending the Growth Management Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan, which Includes Amendments to the Circulation Element, Land Use Element, and Safety Element, of the General Plan in Compliance with Measures C and J

Resolution No. 2009-21

WHEREAS, the City desires to amend the Growth Management Element of the General Plan, which includes amendments to the Circulation Element, Land Use Element, and Safety Element of the General Plan to establish a comprehensive, long-range program that will match the demands for multi-modal transportation facilities and services generated by new development with plans, capital improvement programs and development mitigation programs in compliance with Measures C and J ("General Plan Amendment");

WHEREAS, the General Plan Amendment was referred to all affected public agencies pursuant to Government Code section 65352;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") the City analyzed the environmental impacts that would result from the proposed General Plan Amendment and compared them to the impacts analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") previously prepared for the General Plan;

WHEREAS, the City determined that an Addendum to the General Plan EIR should be prepared pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15164 since the General Plan Amendment would not result in any new or substantially greater significant impacts, as documented by the analysis contained in the Addendum;

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2009, the Planning Commission of the City of Lafayette ("Planning Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the General Plan Amendment, at which time all persons wishing to testify in connection with the General Plan Amendment were heard and the General Plan Amendment was fully studied;

WHEREAS, on April 16, 2009, the Planning Commission recommended adoption of the Addendum for and approval of, the General Plan Amendment;

WHEREAS, on May 11, 2009, the City Council of the City of Lafayette ("City Council") conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the General Plan Amendment, at which time all persons wishing to testify in connection with the General Plan Amendment were heard and the General Plan Amendment was fully studied; and

WHEREAS, all other legal prerequisites to the adoption of this Resolution have occurred.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

Section 1. Based on the entire record before the City Council, all written and oral evidence presented to the City Council, and the findings made in this Resolution, the City Council hereby: (a) amends the Growth Management Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; (b) amends the Circulation Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; (c) amends the Land Use Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "C" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and (d) amends the Safety Element of the General Plan as described in more detail in Exhibit "D" attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2. An Addendum has been prepared for the General Plan Amendment in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State CEQA Guidelines and the City Council hereby adopts the

Addendum attached hereto as Exhibit "E" and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 3. The location and custodian of the documents and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council based its decision is as follows: City Clerk, City of Lafayette, 3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd. #210, Lafayette, California 94549-1968.

Section 4. This Resolution shall become effective thirty (30) days after its adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Lafayette at a regular meeting of said Council on May 11, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

Joanne Robbins, City Clerk

APPROVED:

Don Tatzin, Mayor

Attachments

1. Exhibit "A" - Amendments to Growth Management Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
2. Exhibit "B" - Amendments to Circulation Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
3. Exhibit "C" - Amendments to Land Use Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
4 Exhibit "D" - Amendments to Safety Element of the City of Lafayette General Plan
5. Exhibit "E" – Addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report

EXHIBIT "A"

AMENDMENTS TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE GENERAL PLAN

Page VIII-1

Growth Management is a concept that allows for a rate of growth that can be supported by the City's infrastructure and does not diminish the community's quality of life and identity. The function of the Growth Management Element is to define the geographical extent of urban growth and manage the impacts of that growth by virtue of the Urban Limit Line.

Page VIII-1 to VIII-3

~~Lafayette has several constraints to meeting adopted service standards. As Lafayette's street system provides access to and from other jurisdictions, the most significant constraint is the large volumes of through traffic on Lafayette's streets, especially Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Moraga Road, and Pleasant Hill Road north of Highway 24. Another significant constraint is that the City provides a limited range of services. Lafayette depends on separate agencies for most of its essential services including: potable water supply from the East Bay Municipal Utility District; wastewater treatment from the Contra Costa Central Sanitary District; and fire protection from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. The City contracts with the Contra Costa County Sheriff for police services. The City maintains ongoing communication with provider agencies for all services.~~

Page VIII-1

The goals, policies and programs in this section are consistent with the requirements of ~~the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program ("Measure C"), approved by Contra Costa County voters in 1988~~ Contra Costa's Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan ("Measure J") approved by Contra Costa County Voters in 2004 and with Government Code §65303.

Page VIII-1 & VIII-2

BACKGROUND

The Measure J Growth Management Program, adopted by voters of Contra Costa County in November 2004, requires each local jurisdiction to meet the following six requirements:

- Adopt a development mitigation program;
- Address Housing Options;
- Participate in an Ongoing Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process;
- Adopt an Urban Limit Line (ULL);
- Develop a five-year capital improvement program; and
- Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution.

Measure J (2004) is a 25-year extension of the previous Measure C Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program approved by the voters in 1988.

Both programs include a ½ percent tax on transportation use and retail transactions intended to address existing major regional transportation problems. The Growth Management component is intended to assure that future residential business and commercial growth pays for the facilities required to meet the demands resulting from that growth.

Compliance with the Growth Management Program is linked to receipt of Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds and Transportation for Livable Community funds from the Transportation Authority. The Growth Management Program defined by the original Ordinance 88-01 continues in effect along with its linkage to Local Street maintenance and improvement funds through March 31, 2009. Beginning on April 1, 2009, the Measure J Growth Management Program requirements take effect.

Measure J eliminates the previous Measure C mandate for local performance standards and level-of-service standards for non-regional routes. Lafayette elects to maintain these standards as part of this Element. Measure J also adds the requirement for adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line.

Page VIII-2

INTENT

By updating this Element, Lafayette intends to establish a comprehensive, long-range program that will match the demands for multi-modal transportation facilities and services generated by new development with plans, capital improvement programs and development mitigation programs. The Urban Limit Line is intended to promote compact urban development patterns and limit the extension of infrastructure into areas where urban development is not planned.

Page VIII-2
RELATION TO OTHER ELEMENTS

PageVIII-3
ORGANIZATION OF ELEMENT
The Growth Management Element establishes goals and polices, and sets forth corresponding implementation programs, in the following section. The goals, policies, and programs are separated into three categories: Public Facilities and Capital Improvements, Demand for Public Services and Performance Standards, and Other Performance Standards.

Page VIII-3
SECTION II: GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS
INTRODUCTION
Growth Management is a concept that allows for a rate of growth that can be supported by the City's infrastructure and does not diminish the community's quality of life and identity. This vision is outlined in the goals and policies of the Circulation and Land Use Elements of the Lafayette General Plan some of which are reproduced in this section.

Page VIII-3
Excepting transportation improvements, the ~~CCTA~~ City requires that the approval body make one of the following findings before approving a development project: (1) performance standards will be maintained following the project, (2) specific mitigations are required of the project developer to ensure maintenance of adopted standards, or (3) capital projects planned by the City or special district will result in maintenance of adopted standards. Such findings, mitigations, and capital projects must be consistent with approved action plans.

Page VIII-5
Policy LU-19.1[1] [1] Fulfills Measure J requirement to develop a five-year capital improvement program.

PageVIII-5
Refer to the Circulation Chapter for additional policies and programs regarding traffic LOS standards, goals, and mitigation programs ~~consistent with the requirements of "Measure C"~~.

PageVIII-5
~~The CCTA requires that projects estimated to generate over 100 peak hour vehicle trips to conduct a traffic impact study. In addition,~~ For projects expected to generate between 10-50 net new peak-hour trips, the Lamorinda ~~Project~~ Program Management Committee ("LPMC") ~~is~~ requires~~d to review projects that are expected to add an additional 50 peak hour vehicle trips. In such instances, the approval body must make Findings of Consistency with the adopted Level of Service standards and approved action plans in order to approve the project, unless mitigations are in the five year CIP or Findings of Special Circumstances have been made~~ supplemental notification of Lamorinda jurisdictions, SWAT jurisdictions and other CCTA regional transportation planning committees as required in the Lamorinda Action Plan Update. In addition, the CCTA requires that projects estimated to generate over 100 peak-hour vehicle trips to conduct a traffic impact study.

Page VIII-5
Program LU-19.2.5[2]: [2] Fulfills Measure J requirement to adopt a development mitigation program.

Page VIII-6 & VIII-7
~~CCTA~~ Standard V/C Ratio[4] [4]As defined in the CCTA technical Procedures.

The standards shown above apply to all signalized intersections on non-regional routes ~~(routes other than "routes of regional significance" as defined by the CCTA)~~. The ~~CCTA~~ City considers Level of Service standards to be met if (1) measurement of actual conditions at the intersection indicates equal or better operation, or (2) the jurisdiction has adopted capital improvements in its five-year Capital Improvement Plan that will result in operations equal to or better than the standard. ~~, or (3) the jurisdiction has requested Findings of Special Circumstances from CCTA for intersections that will not meet the standard. The CCTA sees these findings as temporary and dependent upon proof of a future, workable solution.~~

If any signalized intersection along a ~~basic~~ non-regional route will not meet adopted standards, the City will first review the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Capital Improvement Plan and consider amendments aimed at meeting the standard. ~~before applying to CCTA for Findings of Special Circumstances.~~

When reporting to the CCTA, Lafayette will complete and submit the required Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. ~~as well as a list of Reporting Intersection on Basic Routes.~~

The following is a discussion regarding the conditions, challenges, and solutions related to Lafayette's regional and non-regional routes.

Page VIII-6 & VIII-7

Pleasant Hill Road Corridor. Pleasant Hill Road north of State Route 24 carries the highest traffic volume of any street. This street functions to connect Lafayette, the Lafayette BART station and State Route 24 with the cities of Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill and Martinez. Designated as Lafayette's only Route of Regional Significance, it is not subject to the adopted Level of Service Standards for ~~basic~~ non-regional routes. Instead, an Action Plan has been prepared that establishes ~~Traffic~~ Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's).

Page VIII-7

Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's): Work toward achieving Lafayette-approved multi-modal transportation service objectives on roads such as Highway 24 and Lafayette's portion of Pleasant Hill Road.

Lafayette is committed to implementing specified local actions in a timely manner, consistent with the adopted Pleasant Hill Road Action Plan, a component of LPMC's Lamorinda Action Plan. This Action Plan, as adopted by the City Council, has been included by the CCTA in the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Designated as Lafayette's only Route of Regional Significance, it is not subject to the adopted Level of Service Standards for non-regional routes. Instead, an Action Plan has been prepared that establishes Multi-modal Traffic Service Objectives (MTSO's).

The City of Lafayette uses the CCTA's travel demand model for analysis of General Plan amendments affecting land use or circulation and development projects that generate more than the threshold number of peak hour trips in order to determine the effects on the regional transportation system and compliance with the MTSOs established in the Lamorinda Action Plan.

Page VIII-7

Program C-7.1.1[5]: [5] Fulfills Measure J requirement to adopt a Transportation Systems Management Ordinance or Resolution.

Page VIII-8 & VIII-9

Goal LU 17	**Establish and maintain clear limits to the future growth of Lafayette.**
Policy LU-17.1	Boundaries of the Sphere of Influence[6]: Maintain Lafayette's Sphere of Influence boundaries as a shown on Map I-7.
Goal LU-18	**Coordinate with other jurisdictions to protect and restore environmental resources and to provide public services.**
Policy LU-18.1[7]	Interjurisdictional Participation: Participate in interjurisdictional planning.
	Program LU-18.1.1: Consider the regional implications of land use decisions when reviewing development proposals and revisions to the Zoning Ordinance or the Lafayette General Plan.
	Program LU-18.1.2: Work with other public entities to ensure that development in their jurisdictions does not adversely impact Lafayette's ability to achieve its General Plan goals.
Policy LU-18.2	Coordination of Public Services: Coordinate water supply, flood control, wastewater and solid waste disposal, soil conservation, and open space preservation with other jurisdictions to create the greatest public benefit and the least degree of environmental impact.
	Program LU-18.2.1: Periodically review level of service standards with the districts providing water supply, flood control, wastewater and solid waste disposal, soil conservation, and open space preservation.
	Refer to the Growth Management and Infrastructure Section for a discussion of levels of service for public services.
	Program LU-18.2.2: Monitor growth and infrastructure capacity through project review under CEQA and through coordination with provider agencies.
	Program LU-18.2.3: Consider infrastructure and service capacity when reviewing development proposals.
Policy LU-18.3	Regional Transportation Efforts: Participate in regional transportation planning efforts. Refer to the Circulation Chapter for policies and programs related to the City's participation in regional transportation planning. Refer to the Growth Management and Infrastructure section regarding specific policies and programs of the Growth Management Plan.

[6] The City's Sphere of Influence is consistent with the Urban Limit Line defined in the Contra Costa County General Plan. The City formally adopted the voter approved County Urban Limit Line via Resolution 2008-39. Fulfills Measure J requirement

to adopt an Urban Limit Line.

[7] Fulfills Measure J requirement to participate in on-going cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process.

Page VIII-9

Program S-4.1.3: Encourage the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District including paramedic services to improve its response time ~~and fireflow~~ for Lafayette, particularly in the urban wildland fire interface zones. The location of fire stations should strive for a five-minute response time.

Program S-4.2.7: Enforce the Fire Safety Ordinance requiring sprinkler systems for new residential development more than 1.5 miles from a fire station, ~~or~~ beyond the 3-minute response time, and other applicable triggers.

Page VIII-10

Policy LU-20.6 Sewage Treatment and Disposal: Coordinate planning with the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District to ensure the continued availability of adequate sewage collection, treatment, and disposal facilities to meet the needs of future development. The standard for review shall be the capability to transport and treat to standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board average daily effluent for all residential ~~(100 gallons per capita)~~ and nonresidential ~~(1500 gallons per acre)~~ projects.

Page VIII-10

Program LU-20.7.2: Require developers to enter into agreements in accordance with the regulations and ordinances of the EBMUD and pay for the cost of potable and appropriate non-potable water infrastructure required for each project.

Page VIII-10 & VIII-11

Program LU – 20.8: Request EBMUD to complete a water supply assessment when required by Sections 10910 to 10915 of the California Water Code and Section 15155 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidlelines.

Program LU-20.9: Require that proposed developments located outside of EBMUD's current service area contact the Contra Costa Local Formation Commission to apply for annexation. In addition, areas outside of EBMUD's current annexed service area require approval by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation prior to providing water service to any development.

Program LU-20.10: Where a new main is necessary, require project sponsors to submit copies of all known information regarding soil and groundwater quality within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries. When contamination exists, require a specific written remediation plan establishing the methodology, planning, and design of all necessary systems for the removal, treatment, and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater within a construction area for pipelines and services.

Program LU-20.11: Make project sponsors aware of the water efficiency requirements of the EBMUD Water Service Regulations and local codes early in the design development process. Request that project applicants meet with EBMUD staff to discuss water efficient technology and best management practice applicable to their project.

Program LU-20.12: Require project sponsors of new or redevelopment projects within the City, where a new main is required, to coordinate and consult with EBMUD regarding the feasibility of providing recycled water for appropriate non-potable purposes per EBMUD's policy 8.01.

Page VIII-11

EBMUD has developed an extensive ~~reclamation~~ recycled water and water conservation program.

Page VIII-11

Program. P-1.3.1: Use the standard of up to five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents for the dedication, acquisition, and improvement of parkland pursuant to the provisions of the Quimby Act. (Government Code §66477)

Page VIII-12

Policy S-3.2 Flood Protection Standard: In the review of flood control for proposed new development, establish as a standard the flood recurrence intervals used by the Contra Costa County Flood Control District (e.g. the 100-year flood event) ~~for watersheds with area greater than five square miles.)~~

Page VIII-12

Program C-4.2.2: Ensure that new developments provide adequate on-site improvements, such as delivery access, on-site vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation amenities, public transit facilities, and off-street parking, as appropriate.

Page VIII-12 & VIII-13

Goal H-2[9]

Facilitate and encourage the development of diverse housing types and additional affordable housing units to accommodate a diversity of Lafayette citizens in terms of age and socio-economic background and to meet regional housing needs to be specified in the Housing Element.

[9] Fulfills Measure J requirement to address housing options.

Policy H-2.1

Mixed Use: Encourage the ~~development~~ rehabilitation and development of residential uses in commercial areas where the viability of the commercial activities would not be adversely affected.

Program H-2.1.1: Housing Rehabilitation in Non-Residential Areas: Continue to permit ~~new housing units and~~ housing rehabilitation in commercial zoning districts. ~~subject to approval of a land use permit as specified in the Zoning Ordinance.~~

Policy H-2.7

Infill Housing: Encourage private housing development on existing infill sites in order to efficiently utilize existing infrastructure.

Refer to the Housing Chapter for additional housing implementation programs.

EXHIBIT "B"

AMENDMENTS TO CIRCULATION ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE GENERAL PLAN

Page II-6

Pleasant Hill Road Corridor. Pleasant Hill Road north of State Route 24 carries the highest traffic volume of any street. This street functions to connect Lafayette, the Lafayette BART station and State Route 24 with the cities of Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill and Martinez. Designated as Lafayette's only Route of Regional Significance, it is not subject to the adopted Level of Service Standards for ~~basic~~ non-regional routes. Instead, an Action Plan has been prepared that establishes ~~Traffic~~ Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's).

Page II-14

~~CCTA~~ Standard V/C Ratio[4] [4]As defined in the CCTA technical Procedures.

Page II-17

The ~~Measure C~~ CCTA Growth Management Program requires each jurisdiction in Contra Costa County to adopt a Transportation Systems Management Ordinance.

Page II-21

Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO's): Work toward achieving Lafayette-approved multi-modal transportation service objectives on roads such as Highway 24 and Lafayette's portion of Pleasant Hill Road.

EXHIBIT "C"

AMENDMENTS TO LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE GENERAL PLAN

Page I-27
The goals, policies and programs in this section are consistent with the requirements of ~~the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program ("Measure C"), approved by Contra Costa County voters in 1988~~ Contra Costa's Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan ("Measure J") approved by Contra Costa County Voters in 2004 and with Government Code §65303.

Page I-27
Growth Management is a concept that allows for a rate of growth that can be supported by the City's infrastructure and does not diminish the community's quality of life and identity.

Page I-29
Refer to the Circulation Chapter for additional policies and programs regarding traffic LOS standards, goals, and mitigation programs ~~consistent with the requirements of "Measure C"~~.

Page I-30
Program LU20.4.2: Encourage the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District including paramedic services to improve its response time ~~and fireflow~~ for Lafayette, particularly in the urban wildland fire interface zones.

Page I-30
Program LU-20.7.2: Require developers to enter into agreements in accordance with the regulations and ordinances of the EBMUD and pay for the cost of potable and appropriate non-potable water infrastructure required for each project.

Page I-31
Program LU-20.7.5: Request EBMUD to complete a water supply assessment when required by Sections 10910 to 10915 of the California Water Code and Section 15155 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidlelines.

Program LU-20.7.6: Require that proposed developments located outside of EBMUD's current service area contact the Contra Costa Local Formation Commission to apply for annexation. In addition, areas outside of EBMUD's current annexed service area require approval by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation prior to providing water service to any development.

Program LU-20.7.7: Where a new main is necessary, require project sponsors to submit copies of all known information regarding soil and groundwater quality within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries. When contamination exists, require a specific written remediation plan establishing the methodology, planning, and design of all necessary systems for the removal, treatment, and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater within a construction area for pipelines and services.

Program LU-20.7.8: Make project sponsors aware of the water efficiency requirements of the EBMUD Water Service Regulations and local codes early in the design development process. Request that project applicants meet with EBMUD staff to discuss water efficient technology and best management practice applicable to their project.

Program LU-20.7.9: Require project sponsors of new or redevelopment projects within the City, where a new main is required, to coordinate and consult with EBMUD regarding the feasibility of providing recycled water for appropriate non-potable purposes per EBMUD's policy 8.01.

Page I-31
EBMUD has developed an extensive ~~reclamation~~ recycled water and water conservation program.

EXHIBIT "D"

AMENDMENTS TO SAFETY ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE GENERAL PLAN

Page VI-7
Policy S-3.2 Flood Protection Standard: In the review of flood control for proposed new development, establish as a standard the flood recurrence intervals used by the Contra Costa County Flood Control District (e.g. the 100-year flood event) ~~for watersheds with area greater than five square miles.)~~

Page VI-8
Program S-4.1.3: Encourage the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District including paramedic services to improve its response time ~~and fireflow~~ for Lafayette, particularly in the urban wildland fire interface zones. The location of fire stations should strive for a five-minute response time.

Page VI-9
Program S-4.2.7: Enforce the Fire Safety Ordinance requiring sprinkler systems for new residential development more than 1.5 miles from a fire station, ~~or~~ beyond the 3-minute response time, and other applicable triggers.

EXHIBIT "E"

ADDENDUM TO GENERAL PLAN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

[Attached behind this page]

DRAFT

ADDENDUM TO THE LAFAYETTE GENERAL PLAN REVISION FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

State Clearing House No. 2002042035
Application: GP02-09

Prepared March, 2009

Adopted City Council Resolution 2009-21 on _____
Adopted Planning Commission Resolution 2009-05 on April 16, 2009

Prepared for: City of Lafayette
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 210
Lafayette, California 94549

Prepared by: Sarah Allen, Planning Intern, & Michael P. Cass, Assistant Planner
City of Lafayette
3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Suite 210
Lafayette, California 94549

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Number		Page
1.0	Executive Summary	2
2.0	Project Overview	2
2.1	Purpose of the EIR Addendum	2
2.2	Certified General Plan EIR	3
2.3	Project Description	3
3.0	Impact Analysis	4
3.1	Geology and Soils	4
3.2	Hydrology and Drainage	5
3.3	Vegetation and Wildlife	6
3.4	Cultural Resources	8
3.5	Traffic and Circulation	8
3.6	Air Quality	10
3.7	Noise	10
3.8	Aesthetics	11
3.9	Parks and Recreation	12
3.10	Fire Protection	13
3.11	Police Protection	14
3.12	Wastewater	14
3.13	Water	14
3.14	Schools	15
3.15	Solid Waste	15
3.16	Energy Use	15
3.17	Land Use	16
3.18	Growth-Inducing Impacts	17
3.19	Cumulative Impacts	17

1.0 Executive Summary

The City of Lafayette is proposing to update the Growth Management Element ("GME") of the General Plan ("the Plan") in order to comply with the provisions of Measure J and maintain access to transportation funds provided by the measure. Currently the City has a Growth Management Element that is compliant with Measure C. The proposed project analyzed in this Addendum (the "Project") modifies existing language to reflect the changes in the measures as well as adjusts service standards based on feedback from various agencies. This Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") Addendum assesses whether the impacts generated by the modifications would create any new or substantially greater significant impacts than were assessed in the General Plan EIR ("GP EIR") that was certified for the adopted General Plan in October 2002.

The relatively minor modifications to the GME to be made by the Project do not alter the analyses or conclusions of the GP EIR. The GP EIR was a program EIR that determined whether the goals, policies, and programs of the General Plan would result in significant impacts to the environment, and suggested mitigation for the reduction of these impacts to the extent feasible. This Addendum finds that the proposed Project would not result in any new or substantially greater significant impacts that were not identified and assessed in the GP EIR. It finds that the additional impact generated by the Project would not cause a significant increase to any of the previously-identified impacts. Finally, it finds that the General Plan policies and programs that are listed as mitigation measures for each of the defined impacts of the General Plan would, at a program level of analysis, continue to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation measures would be required at the program level. Consequently, and as per California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Guidelines sections 15162 and 15164, a subsequent EIR is not required for the Project and the City Council may adopt this Addendum in fulfillment of its obligations under CEQA.

2.0 Project Overview

2.1 Purpose of the EIR Addendum

In 1988, Contra Costa County voters approved Measure C, a half cent sales tax to be dedicated to transportation over a 20-year period. That measure would have sunset in 2009; however, in 2004 the voters approved Measure J, which authorized a 25-year extension to the tax. The City currently receives over $300,000 per year in transportation funding for road maintenance as well as funds for other transportation improvements that are dependant on a Growth Management Element that complies with the provisions of the aforementioned measures.

The General Plan's current Growth Management Element establishes the policies and standards for traffic levels of service and performance standards for fire, police, parks,

sanitary facilities, water, and flood control, among others. The objective is to establish goals, policies, and implementation programs that are intended to manage and mitigate the impacts of the inevitable future growth and development within the City.

Revenue collected through the increased sales tax is used for large mutually beneficial transportation projects identified in the Measure's Expenditure Plan (such as the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel). Additionally, each jurisdiction receives a portion of the remaining funding known as Return-to-Source Funds. To ensure the City continues to receive funding, the City must update the GME to comply with the requirements set forth in Measure J.

CEQA allows the preparation of an Addendum to evaluate changes to a project that occur after certification of an EIR, provided that none of the criteria listed in State CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a), which would require a Subsequent EIR, are present. Chief among these criteria, and the only inquiry relevant to the present Project, is whether the proposed changes to the GME would result in new or substantially greater significant impacts as compared to those identified in the GP EIR. The City has determined, as demonstrated and supported by the analysis in this Addendum, that the changes to the General Plan resulting from the modifications to the GME are not substantial, will not result in new or substantially greater significant impacts than identified and assessed in the General Plan EIR, and would not require new mitigation measures or General Plan policies not already included in the EIR. Based on these conclusions, the City has determined that an Addendum to the EIR is the appropriate CEQA document to address the modifications to the GME.

2.2 Certified General Plan EIR

The City certified the EIR for the General Plan revision prior to adopting the new General Plan in October 2002. The GP EIR concluded that, at a program level, the impacts of future development possible under the General Plan would all be reduced to a less than significant level given the policies and programs of the General Plan except for the cumulative traffic impact to Highway 24. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for the impact to Highway 24, and the City approved a Statement of Overriding Considerations when adopting the new General Plan to explain why the General Plan was being approved despite this remaining significant and unavoidable impact.

2.3 Project Description

The City proposes to update the Growth Management Element of the General Plan to reflect changes in the laws (Measure C and Measure J) governing this element. Several of the changes are language modifications to clarify understanding and ensure irrelevant references to Measure C are removed. More substantial changes include the addition of policy under the service standards which are more restrictive of growth ensuring the City

and relevant agencies have the capability to serve the needs of new development. The element in general is intended to maintain current service standards and disallow growth if those standards are unobtainable.

See appendix A for complete list of changes to the Element.

3.0 Impact Analysis

The following sections of this Addendum describe whether the potential impacts of the proposed Project would have any new or substantially greater significant impacts than those described in the EIR for the existing General Plan. Each impact that was presented in the GP EIR is included below. The numbering of each impact is the same as was used in the GP EIR.

3.1 Geology and Soils

Impact 4.1-A Population and employment activity increases under the proposed Draft Plan would increase the number of persons exposed to risk of injury or death or property damage resulting from seismic events in the area.

Population increases under the General Plan would increase the number of persons exposed to risk of injury or death or property damage resulting from seismic events in the area. The Project would not add any new units or residents to be exposed to this hazard. Any new development would still be subject to the General Plan policies and programs that require that their design and construction be capable of withstanding seismic events. The Project does not include development, nor does it make any changes to the GPE or General Plan that would affect the design and construction standards that apply to any development that would otherwise occur under the existing General Plan. Therefore, the Project would not change the significance of this impact.

Impact 4.1-B Development has the potential of exposing additional people and structures to slope failure hazard.

The Project would not add any new units or residents that could be exposed to slope failure hazards, as the Project does not include any increase in development potential as compared to the existing General Plan. Therefore, the Project would not cause a new or substantially greater significant impact in this regard.

Impact 4.1-C Seismic events could result in the failure of dams which could cause injury or death and property damage.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

Impact 4.1-D Construction will increase erosion from soils. This erosion can cause sedimentation of streams in Lafayette and other waterways.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES erosion control requirements. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

3.2 Hydrology and Drainage

Impact 4.2-A Future development within the 100-year floodplain will expose people and improvements to flood hazards.

The Project modifies various portions of the GME, but does not change the policies of the General Plan that reduce the risk of flooding. Furthermore, the proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. All future development will remain subject to the General Plan goals and policies related to reducing flood hazards. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

Impact 4.2-B Future development will increase the area covered with impermeable surfaces which will increase the amount of runoff from the site. This runoff can result in increased flooding in the City storm drain system and/or along receiving waterways.

The Project does not include development or new impervious surfaces. The Project modifies various portions of the GME, but does not change the policies of the General Plan that address the accommodation of runoff within the City storm drain system. Furthermore, the Project's proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR; therefore, the amount of impervious area to be created in the future will not be increased as compared to under the General Plan. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

Impact 4.2-C Increased runoff into Lafayette streams will aggravate existing problems of creek bank slumping. Continued loss of creek bank can threaten lives and structures located along the streams. The sedimentation from this slumping could cause additional flooding and adversely affect the aquatic habitat along these streams.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES erosion control requirements, as well as policies addressing the adequacy of drainage within the City. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

Impact 4.2-D Increased runoff from impermeable surfaces will increase the transport of oils, greases, and other non-natural residues to receiving waterways.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES water quality control requirements. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project.

3.3 Vegetation and Wildlife

Impact 4.3-A Future development could result in the injury or death of Special Status Species and/or destruction of habitat required by these species.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR as being subject to development. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to special status species or their habitat.

Impact 4.3-B New development may create barriers to animal movement and dispersal.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to the creation of barrier to animal movement and dispersal.

Impact 4.3-C New development would generate erosion and increase runoff from impermeable surface which would result in increased pollution of aquatic habitats plants to habitats in Lafayette.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES water quality and erosion control requirements. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to increases in impacts to aquatic habitats.

Impact 4.3-D Increased runoff from impermeable surfaces will increase the transport of oils, greases, and other non-natural residues to receiving waterways.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES water quality and erosion control requirements. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to impacts to receiving waterways.

Impact 4.3-E Future development may result in the loss of mature, native trees, including Grand Trees.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to requirements pertaining to the preservation of protected trees. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to impacts to mature native trees, including "Grand Trees."

Impact 4.3-F Future development could displace riparian habitat or other wetland habitat.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to federal and state regulatory requirements, such as the obtainment of permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish & Game. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to impacts to riparian or wetland habitats.

Impact 4.3-G New development will cause changes in the plant and animal communities residing in or using Lafayette.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to impacts to plant and animal communities in the City.

3.4 Cultural Resources

Impact 4.4-A Future development has the potential to adversely affect areas of historic or archaeological importance.

The proposed changes to the GME of the General Plan as a part of the Project would not result in any new development above that predicted in the GP EIR, nor would development occur in areas not previously identified in the GP EIR. Development under the General Plan would also continue to be subject to NPDES water quality and erosion control requirements. Consequently, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result from the Project with regard to impacts to receiving waterways.

3.5 Traffic and Circulation

The General Plan and the EIR use two methods for assessing intersection operations. The first, called the Highway Capacity Manual ("HCM") methodology, assesses intersection operations using the average stopped delay per vehicle. This method was found to be the most accurate estimate of actual operating conditions in Lafayette and its Level of Service ("LOS") definitions are used as the goals in the General Plan. The second method, called the Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA") methodology, is also used in the General Plan and the EIR. The CCTA method uses a Critical Movement Analysis to determine LOS which is based on the Volume to Capacity ratio that is found at the intersection.

Impact 4.5-A Buildout under the Draft Plan will add new trips to Lafayette's roadway system.

The amendments to the GME do not call out specific development and therefore would not significantly affect the operations of City streets. Additionally, the proposed amendments would not change the total scope of development to be expected under the General Plan. Thus, the impact would remain reduced to a less than significant level by the mitigation measures listed under Impact 4.5-A. (GP EIR, pp. 110-113.) At a program level, no additional mitigation would be required. No new or substantially

greater significant impacts would result with regard to the levels of service on the City's roadway system.

Impact 4.5-B Traffic generated by new development will create congestion at Lafayette intersections.

The updated element will not increase or decrease traffic as no development or construction is called for beyond that already assessed in the GP EIR; therefore there will be no change in congestion at intersections. The impact would continue to be reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures listed under Impact 4.5-B in the GP EIR. At a program level, no additional mitigation would be required. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would therefore result from the proposed modifications to the GME.

Impact 4.5-C New development would increase traffic on Highway 24

The GP EIR found that the additional traffic added by General Plan buildout plus other cumulative development in the region would cause Highway 24 to operate at an unacceptable LOS. No mitigation is available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. As such, the impact was found to be a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact. The City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations to address this impact when adopting the General Plan. The Project does not encourage or create new development beyond that already allowed by the General Plan (and assessed in the GP EIR) and would not change the determination that this is a significant and unavoidable impact. Thus, the proposed modifications to the GME would not result in a new or substantially greater significant impact.

Impact 4.5-D New development would increase traffic which would increase the chance for traffic accidents.

The proposed Project would not result in new traffic beyond that assessed in the GP EIR as no new units or infrastructure are being created; rather, the updates to the GME are policy changes and language clarification. The policies and programs listed in GP EIR Impact 4.5-D will continue to mitigate the impact to a less than significant level. At a program level, no additional mitigation would be required. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would occur.

Impact 4.5-E New development will generate new traffic on residential streets.

The Project would modify the GME, which is purely a policy document. The changes to the GME would not result in new development beyond that analyzed in the GP EIR and thus would not generate additional vehicle trips or affect the operations of City streets. The impact would remain reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures listed under GP EIR Impact 4.5-E. At a program level, no additional mitigation would be

required, and no new or substantially greater impacts would occur as a result of the proposed modifications to the GME.

Impact 4.5-F New development will increase the demand for bike lanes, walkways, and other means of alternative transport.

The Project would not result in an increase in the amount of development expected as a result of the General Plan, and therefore will not increase the City's population and therefore the demand for bike lanes, walkways, and alternative forms of transport will not exist. The GME does not call for or direct new development, it merely evaluates it to ensure service standards are met. The General Plan policies and programs listed under Impact 4.5-F provide the framework for providing these facilities for the City's population. The impact would remain reduced to a less than significant level by mitigation measures listed under GP EIR Impact 4.5-F. At a program level, no additional mitigation would be required, and thus no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result.

3.6 Air Quality

Impact 4.6-A Future development in Lafayette will increase emission of pollutants into the air.

The GP EIR determined that the General Plan was consistent with the Clean Air Plan since the development allowed under the General Plan would increase daily trips by 11.5% while the Clean Air Plan was based on a projected 13% increase in daily trips. The General Plan would remain consistent after implementation of the Project since the Project itself will not result in additional new development and thus would not change the amount of daily trips that would result. Furthermore, the General Plan was found to be consistent with Clean Air Plan Transportation Control Measures ("TCM") and impacts regarding odors and toxics. The General Plan would remain consistent with these criteria as the proposed modifications to the GME would not result in additional future growth. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result due to the Project and thus, at the program level, no additional mitigation measures are required.

3.7 Noise

Impact 4.7-A New noise-sensitive development could be allowed in areas with excessive noise levels. Existing residences and other noise-sensitive land uses may be exposed to excessive noise levels.

The GME, as modified by the proposed Project, would not call for new construction or development in noisy locations and therefore will not change the noise level or exposure

to noise. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result, and. no additional mitigation is required.

Impact 4.7-B Future development may result in increased noise levels from increased automobile traffic, public transit, aircraft, trains, stationary noise sources, and construction activities.

The Project does not create new units, construction, or additional modes of transit. Individual development projects are evaluated for noise impacts. The modifications to the GME will not change the noise environment since no new additional development would be allowed above that permitted by the current General Plan. In addition, the policies and programs of the General Plan require noise studies and noise reduction for new development. Therefore, the Project would not cause a new or substantially greater significant noise impact, and noise impacts due to the implementation of the General Plan would remain less than significant. No additional mitigation would be required.

3.8 Aesthetics

Impact 4.8-A Development under the Draft General Plan will result in the loss of open space in Lafayette.

There are no sites identified for development under the revised GME. Existing open space will remain intact with the revisions to the GME, and individual development projects are subject to the policies and programs of the General Plan which require setbacks from ridgelines, preservation of open space features, design review to ensure consistency with the neighborhood and maintenance of privacy, and preservation of views, as well as the hillside development regulations in the Municipal Code. Under these circumstances, along with the fact that the Project would not increase the amount of development allowed under the existing General Plan, there would be no new or substantially greater significant impact as compared to those identified in the GP EIR. No additional mitigation would be required.

Impact 4.8-B There is the potential that new development in undeveloped areas could be inconsistent with the scale and character of existing residential neighborhoods.

The General Plan contains design policies and requires design review to address these potential impacts. The proposed Project does not call for or enable new development beyond that already allowed by the General Plan. Consequently, there would be no new or substantially greater significant impact as compared to those identified in the EIR No additional mitigation would be required.

Impact 4.8-C Redevelopment of the Downtown area could clash with the scale and character of that area.

The Project does not include development in or near the Downtown, nor does it propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.8-D New development may create aesthetically displeasing views at City entryways.

The Project does not include development in or near the City entryways, nor does it propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.8-E New development could adversely affect views of Mt. Diablo and hillsides surrounding the City.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.8-F New development will include lighting that may adversely affect nighttime views.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.9 Parks and Recreation

Impact 4.9-A The increase in the City's population would require the designation/acquisition of additional parkland to conform with adopted park standards.

The GME, as modified by the proposed Project, would maintain the standard of up to five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Additionally, the GME includes the policy to apply the maximum standard for parks to new developments. The General Plan contains policies and programs to provide additional parkland. The policies and programs (listed in Impact 4.9-A) would continue to provide the means of providing adequate parkland. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result under the Project.

Impact 4.9-B Development could create a barrier to proposed extensions of the City's trail system.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.9-C Additional development will create the need for additional bike lanes and bike paths.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.10 Fire Protection

Impact 4.10-A New development will increase the calls for fire protection.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Additionally, the GME requires new development to mitigate the impact it will have on service standards. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.10-B New development on certain ridges and adjacent to wildland areas will be at risk from wildfires.

The Project does not. propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.10-C New development will increase the demand for emergency medical response.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. The GME includes service standards to ensure adequate fire and paramedic response times. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact..

3.11 Police Protection

Impact 4.11-A New development will require police protection.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. The GME includes standards ensuring adequate police services. Mitigation is required of new development to maintain the standards. No new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.12 Wastewater

Impact 4.12-A New development will generate additional wastewater.

The GME is a policy document that contains policies intended to ensure adequate sewage collection, treatment, and disposal is provided for existing and new development. The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.12-B Growth in certain areas of the City may generate wastewater that cannot be adequately collected by existing sewer collectors.

The GME is a policy document that contains policies intended to ensure adequate sewage collection, treatment, and disposal is provided for existing and new development. The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.13 Water

Impact 4.13-A New development will increase the demand for domestic water.

The GME is a policy document that contains policies intended to ensure adequate water supply is provided for existing and new development. The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.13-B New development may require improvements in the water storage and delivery systems.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.14 Schools

Impact 4.14-A Buildout under the Draft General Plan will generate new students attending Lafayette School District schools.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Additionally, the GME provides a policy to ensure school-age children are adequately served by the district. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.14-B Buildout under the Draft General Plan will generate new students attending Acalanes Union High School District schools.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.15 Solid Waste

Impact 4.15-A New development will generate additional solid waste.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Additionally the GME contains some of the policies sited in the EIR as mitigation to this impact. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.16 Energy Use

Impact 4.16-A New development will use energy to construct and operate.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.17 Land Use

Impact 4.17-A New development could substantially increase the City's population and thereby overwhelm the City's ability to provide services.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.17-B Development under the Draft General Plan will increase the number of dwelling units and jobs in Lafayette.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.17-C New development in the Downtown area may alter the character of downtown Lafayette.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.17-D Annexations of land outside the City Limits will allow additional development.

Annexation into the City must be approved by the Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO") and must be consistent with General Plan goals and policies. The Project does not involve annexation; therefore, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result under this threshold of significance.

Impact 4.17-E Future development could conflict with plans of other agencies or jurisdictions.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

Impact 4.17-F Development allowed under the Plan could alter land use patterns in Lafayette.

The Project does not propose additional new development beyond that allowed in the existing General Plan. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result with regard to this impact.

3.18 Growth-Inducing Impacts

The Project does not involve any additional development. Parcels within the City could only be developed per the applicable General Plan land use designation for the parcels and consistent with General Plan policies and programs as well as all other City land use regulations. Development would occur only insofar as infrastructure and services are available. The GME is meant to manage growth and not induce it, and the proposed Project would not change this. Growth-inducing impacts were found to be less than significant in the GP EIR and there would no change to this impact as a result of the Project. Thus, no new or substantially greater significant impacts would result.

3.19 Cumulative Impacts

The GP EIR determined that the potentially significant cumulative impacts of conversion of prime agricultural lands, loss of open space, increased demand for public services, increased air pollution, and increased exposure to earthquakes were all reduced to a less than significant level by policies and programs included in the General Plan. The only significant and unavoidable cumulative impact was increased congestion on Highway 24.

As explained in previous sections of this Addendum, the Project would not increase the level of impact on any of these resources as no development is proposed or required beyond that allowed by the existing General Plan. Furthermore, individual development projects are evaluated to ensure the impacts are mitigated. All the cumulative impacts would remain less than significant other than for increased congestion on Highway 24 for which City adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations when approving the General Plan. Since the proposed Project would not result in additional growth beyond that already predicted in the GP EIR, it would not result in any new or substantially greater contributions to significant cumulative impacts.